DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 184 UD 033 813

AUTHOR Fisher, Teresa A.; Matthews, Linda

TITLE Examining Interventions for Highly Mobile Students and Their Families.

PUB DATE 1999-04-00

NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Counselors; Elementary Education; *Intervention; *Principals; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Qualitative Research; *Student Mobility; *Transient Children

ABSTRACT

Consensual qualitative research was used to examine school interventions that were perceived to help stabilize highly mobile schools and their families. This study focuses on the types of programs implemented as well as the effective program components that encouraged families to remain affiliated with a school. Five principals, 10 counselors, and 3 social workers, representing 18 elementary schools, were interviewed. The results indicate that schools with highly mobile student populations have a diverse network of programs that provide the following curricular and extra-curricular services: (1) academic support; (2) personal development of students; (3) family support; and (4) community building for students and parents. The data regarding the most effective program components suggest that schools implementing family interventions need to emphasize positive relationships with parents by creating a sense of community at the school and demonstrating that parents are always welcome. In addition, schools must address the academic and social development of students by establishing clear academic expectations and increase their interactions with educators who care about students and believe all students can learn. (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 184

Examining Interventions for Highly Mobile Students and Their Families

Teresa A. Fisher & Linda Matthews

Arizona State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Fisher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

American Educational Research Association

1999 Annual Meeting-Montreal

(This paper should not be reproduced without the written permission of the authors).

*Correspondence should be addressed to: Teresa A. Fisher, Assistant Professor , Arizona State University, Division of Psychology in Education, P.O Box 870611, Tempe, AZ 85287-0611; e-mail: T.A.Fisher@asu.edu

UD033813

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Consensual qualitative research was used to examine school interventions that were perceived to help stabilize highly mobile schools and their families. This study focused on the types of programs implemented as well as the effective program components that encouraged families to remain affiliated with a school. The results indicate that highly mobile schools have a diverse network of programs that provide the following curricular and extra-curricular services: academic support, personal development of students, family support, and community building for students and parents. The data regarding the most effective program components, suggest that schools implementing family interventions need to emphasize positive relationships with parents by creating a sense of community at the school and demonstrating that parents are always welcome. In addition, schools must address the academic and social development of students by establishing clear academic expectations and increase their interactions with educators who care about students and believe all students can learn.

Examining Interventions for Highly Mobile Students and Their Families

Arguably, one of the most salient factors impacting the effectiveness of instructional strategies and student learning is the presupposition that students do, in fact, maintain a consistent and ongoing presence within a particular educational environment. However, recent studies of student enrollment and attendance patterns have challenged the existence of such "stability" and have provided startling statistics reflecting a trend toward what has been referred to as "mobility" among student populations (Kerbow, 1996; Lash & Kirkpatrick, 1990; National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 1995). In recent years, the concept of mobility has attracted attention in the educational literature and has been conceptualized by various researchers. Notwithstanding the multiplicity of definitions of student mobility, the phenomenon consistently has been characterized by an inconsistency and/or interruption in the educational experience of the student. Investigations of changing enrollment patterns in schools across the country have identified a host of factors which contribute to student movement and instability of a student's educational experience; sources of student mobility ranged from changes in family structure, such as divorce and change in guardianship, to job-related transience including military transfers and migrant labor (Karweit, 199?; Kerbow, 1996; Lash & Kirkpatrick, 1990). (This body of research has also addressed the ecumenical implications of student movement on the individual student, the teacher, and school administration.

In a study of Chicago public elementary schools, Kerbow (1996) examined patterns of mobility in urban areas. He reported that only 38% of 6th graders had attended the same school throughout their elementary school years; furthermore, an examination of enrollment patterns over a 2-year period revealed that more than 36% of the students in the study had changed schools at least once and that 13% had attended three or more schools. Among those sources of student mobility cited in this study were a lack of adequate low-income housing, family instability, and school-related factors such as safety issues and academic difficulty. Similar findings of high student mobility have been reported in investigations of other specific geographical regions, as well as the nation at large (GAO, 1994; Lash & Kirkpatrick, 1990; NCES, 1995; White, 1997). Given the rise of student mobility in recent years, it is not uncommon for schools to report that less than 15% of their student population has attended the school for at least three consecutive years. Schools based in areas abundantly occupied by rental units such as apartments and hotels/motels are particularly subject to student transience associated with changes in residence. A student and his/her family may be forced to relocate following a rent increase or eviction. Or a student may transfer schools when a parent/guardian finds work in another district. Even "upward" mobility, such as home-ownership or movement into a higher socioeconomic status, is not without its effects on the continuity of a student's educational experience.

Because the backgrounds, needs, and concerns of those individuals who comprise the population of mobile students are as varied as the reasons that underlie student movement, there

exists no prototypic profile of "the mobile student." However, various researchers have identified several characteristics that tend to be more often associated with mobile students than their more stable counterparts (Kerbow, 1996; Karweit, 199?); for example, highly mobile students are more likely to be inner-city dwellers and to represent lower socioeconomic status than stable students. Mobility has also been found to be related to achievement and attendance such that highly mobile students tend to demonstrate lower levels of achievement and to be more likely to drop out of school; related research findings have suggested relationships between student mobility and behavior problems, academic deficiencies, and social inadequacies (Alexander, Dauber, & Entwisle, 1996; Ingersoll, Scamman, & Eckerling, 1989).

Moreover, many mobile students share the experience of being at increased risk for social and academic challenges given the discontinuity of their educational experience. Students who enter/exit school after the academic term has officially begun often face the challenge of adjusting to social and academic routines which may be well underway upon their arrival at the new school. They often have missed the opportunity to initially bond with teachers, classmates, and the general school community, and they likely will meander through the system without the benefit of any formal indoctrination regarding the school's expectations of student progress and behavior. These students may encounter varying degrees of difficulty accomplishing the multifaceted task of adjusting to a new school environment. For many students, this is no small feat; in addition to the pressures of adapting to a new academic structure and negotiating within a new social milieu,

many students often shoulder the additional burden of coping with the poverty, homelessness, and family dissolution which in fact necessitated or precipitated the school transfer or absenteeism. Undeniably, the reality of such additional considerations clearly illuminates the complicated and often overwhelming nature of the experiences of many highly mobile children.

As evidenced by the examination of the recent literature regarding student mobility, there is a great need to address related issues of academic achievement and psychosocial adjustment among students who have inconsistent patterns of attendance and/or who have attended more than one school over the course of an academic year. Despite the great need for responsiveness on the part of the educational community, relatively few studies have examined specific programmatic interventions relevant to stabilizing school populations and/or remediating the potentially deleterious effects of unstable patterns of attendance on school performance among mobile students. A small number of studies have examined existing school programs which have been developed and implemented specifically for particular sources of student mobility such as seasonal/migrant patterns of attendance. However, even fewer studies have investigated interventions that are more inclusive of or relevant to other populations of mobile students, particularly those with less predictable patterns of mobility. Furthermore, many studies have focused their investigations on curricular innovations or modifications which may be implemented in the classrooms; there is a paucity of literature addressing extra-curricular interventions which may occur at either the instructional or administrative levels of school functioning. Although it

may be presumed that most of the effect of student mobility on school functioning is experienced at the classroom level, much of the literature suggests that the impact of student movement in and out of schools is significant at the administrative level, as well. Disruptions in student attendance and enrollment not only complicate the maintenance of student records but also potentially frustrate administrative efforts to build a stable sense of school comm..nity. The present study endeavors to expand upon the pioneering efforts of recent research on student mobility by presenting an examination of school programs and interventions that have been identified as effective in promoting school stability and supporting the education of mobile students in several school districts in the southwestern region of the United States.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What type of programs were implemented to stabilize schools? (Were these programs specifically for highly mobile families?
2. Which programs have had the most success in bringing stability to schools? (Which program components were perceived as being effective?)

Method

This descriptive study was part of a major research project investigating the scope of urban student mobility as well as the strategies to support their education. At the time participants were selected for the current study, 360 surveys had been distributed to elementary schools in the southwestern section of the United States. There was a 50% return rate, representing 32 school

districts

Participants

Selection of participants. For this study we were particularly interested in interviewing school personnel affiliated with schools that were concentrating on their high rate of mobility. A preliminary examination of data identified 21 schools as having reported high rates of student mobility, as well as school programs and/or interventions designed to respond to the unstable patterns of student enrollment. The participants in the present study were principals (n=5), counselors (n=10), and social workers (n=3). They represented 18 elementary schools.

Researchers. The primary team of investigators consisted of two assistant professors and two graduate students. Given the nature of qualitative research, efforts were made to standardize the collection and analysis of data gathered via the interviews with school personnel. The team of investigators met regularly prior to the data collection phase to identify and formulate a set of relevant core questions and issues to address in the interviews. All four researchers participated in the interview process.

Interview Protocol

The major focus of the interview was to obtain a precise description of the types of school interventions in place that are designed to bring stability to the school and to meet the needs of highly mobile families. The interview was initiated with general warm-up questions regarding the participant's view of school mobility and the impact at their respective school (e.g.," How does

the high rate of student mobility impact your school?"," What are some of the sources of mobility?"). The interviewer proceeded to ask questions specifically about the programs/interventions that were perceived to stabilize the school (e.g., "What are the goals of these interventions?", "Which programs have had the most success in bringing stability to your school?" , Can you identify specific program components that you believe are most effective in keeping families affiliated with your school?). As a wrap-up, participants were asked to respond to questions focusing on ideal strategies for confronting high mobility (e.g. What interventions would you like to see in place regardless of cost?") . The interviewers were trained to obtain as much descriptive information as possible .

Procedure

The 21 identified schools were contacted by a member of the research team and briefly queried regarding their perceptions of student mobility and the impact of their programming on school functioning and student performance. Furthermore, the schools were asked if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview to further explore the nature of the school programs and interventions. Of the 21 schools contacted, 18 agreed to participate in the follow-up interviews.

Data collection. The primary investigators contacted each participant and coordinated the interviews. All of the interviews were audio taped at the participant's school site and ranged from approximately 40 to 60 minutes in length. The interviews were conducted according to the

interview protocol.

Data analysis. Upon transcription of the interviews, the data were analyzed utilizing the consensual qualitative research (CQR) approach (Hill, Thompson & Williams, 1997). Prior to data analysis, the principal investigators had identified major dimensions for organizing interview data and categorizing school programming based upon the research questions and interview protocol. Other guidelines for coding into domains and categories were allowed to generate from the data. Three members of the research team individually coded the data from each interview, then collectively argued to consensus the final conceptualization and categorization of the interventions.

Results

The analysis of interview data revealed three major focal areas which were generated by the types of responses received from the interviewees: 1) programs that stabilize schools; 2) perceptions of effective program components; and 3) contextual factors that help to sustain interventions . Nine domains, each having several relevant categories, were identified under the focal areas. The domains reflect the key topic areas that were identified by the data, while categories represent a summary of the domain's content for each case. Table 1 displays the focus areas, domains, and categories for the 18 cases. As indicated by the CQR procedures (Hill et al., 1997), a category received a "universal" rating if it was relevant to all 18 cases, "typical" if applied to more than half, and a "variant" rating for categories that were applicable to less than

half of the cases but more than two. An overview of the domains and categories follow.

Programs That Stabilize Schools

This first focal area consisted of five domains or types of programs that school personnel believed to be beneficial in stabilizing their student population. The most common criteria schools used to determine stability were consistency in attendance and low mobility rates.

Educational/academic development. Only three of the six categories in this domain received a rating: 1) tutoring, 2)intensive school-wide academic programs, and 3)before or after school programs. It was typical for the participants to specify that various forms of tutoring services enhanced their student's academic development. In the majority of schools, tutoring was conducted by teachers, buddies, or mentors. It was also typical for the educational development to be influenced by a systematic academic approach implemented for the entire school. Such strategies involved nationally recognized math and reading programs (e.g. Success For All). Several of the participants believed that academically oriented before and after school programs were instrumental in helping students "stay on track" academically . These programs were normally organized by the respective teachers at individual schools . As Table 1 specifies, a few participants mentioned that their school had adopted welcome classrooms. These are classrooms in which highly mobile students are assessed and given a chance to become academically acclimated to the school before they are assigned to a regular classroom. This is a relatively new concept that is being evaluated by schools with a highly mobile population.

Personal development of students. The data revealed that schools are implementing programs that focus on enhancing student's social skills. Three categories fell under this domain, two of which have received the most attention: school-wide social skill activities and after school clubs. The school wide activity approach has focused on skills that enhance cooperation in the classroom, and teacher-student relationships (e.g. team building, problem solving). Comparartively, after school clubs tended to concentrate more on developing life and coping skills : (e.g. sibling rivalry, death and dying).

Support to provide basic family needs. The participants considered services for families the best strategy to confront high mobility. They believe that if basic needs such as health concerns, food, and clothing and personal counseling are provided by the schools, then families will be less likely to move frequently. This belief is reflected by the variety of family needs that is represented within this domain. In addition to basic needs, participants reveal that efforts are made to enhance the employability of parents. Schools typically offer before and after school programs so parents can have extended time at work and/or in training. An increasing number of schools are also offering educational development classes for parents (e.g. GED, ESL, computer training). Helping families find affordable housing is an additional resource that schools are utilizing to deal directly with a source of high mobility.

Support to strengthen the family bond. This domain incorporates four categories of family support that have been implemented to enhance the communication and quality time that family

members spend together. Personal/family counseling has been instrumental in providing families with the skills to resolve conflicts and to prevent stressful events from escalating into major obstacles. Family support teams involve several educational personnel (e.g. school counselors, social workers, school psychologists, community liaisons) who assess the family's needs from a very comprehensive perspective. One of the major goals is to keep the parental figures strong so that they can serve as partners in the academic and social development of their children. The family camps are evening and/or weekend events which show parents how to have fun together while accomplishing educational goals (e.g. book sharing, reading with flashlights). Many of the participants indicated that parent education classes are offered to provide parents with a wide range of alternative behaviors to utilize as they develop their child's self-esteem and overall interpersonal skills (e.g. communication and problem-solving skills).

Community building. Under this domain, six categories were identified which served to encourage a sense of affiliation and community within schools for students and parents. The data generated family camps as a category for two domains: support to strengthen the family bond and community building. This cross coding is logical, especially since the participants revealed that these were the two key purposes for the camps. A few of the participants revealed the parental appreciation they received regarding the welcome centers. They were set up to serve new parents entering a school or district, by answering common questions, and describing beneficial community resources. This minimal service appeared to prevent the initial feelings of alienation

that new families often experience. School districts with health and resource clinics also received a heartfelt thanks from parents for having such service on the school site, that was both beneficial and welcoming. One of the most common programs designed to make parents and students feel connected to the school were cultural programs .These programs were usually focused on a specific holiday or festival (e.g. Thanksgiving Feasts, Cinco de Mayo). The last two categories: multiage programs and migrant liaisons, while only identified by a few participants have the potential of being adopted by several school districts. Multiage programs were designed to pace learning at a rate that is comfortable for each student. Students with different age and achievement levels learn to work cooperatively together and with the same teachers for at least two years. Migrant liaisons had the major responsibility of servicing the needs of families that followed seasonal crops. This specialized position helped to create a special bond between families and particular schools, such that parents would in fact request permission for their children to return to the school with which the liaison was associated with, even upon moving out of the district.

Perceptions of Effective Program Components

The second focal area was comprised of two domains: effective programs for families and those for students. These domains and accompanying categories describe what the participants believed to be key factors that encouraged parents and students to remain affiliated with their school.

Effective program components for families. The data indicated that schools that were viewed as a community hub were perceived to have an effective program component by all participants. A community hub was considered to be a school that had at least one program that attracted a wide variety of families (e.g. health clinics, family camps). An additional effective program component that was universal among participants was the belief that making parents feel welcome at their respective schools was essential. It was common practice to greet parents with a smile and to treat them informally yet respectful. Participants believed that unless parents felt comfortable coming to school, the potential benefits of programs would not be realized. A typical perception regarding effective factors was that the educators involved had common goals for the direction of the various family/educational programs. This created a high level of excitement and involvement centered around the programs as well as an increase in morale within the schools. The final category in this domain demonstrates that several participants believed that in order to have effective programs they must satisfactorily accomplish their goals. This belief was especially pronounced among the schools with health and resource centers. It was perceived that meeting the basic needs of families in an efficient manner encouraged them to remain affiliated with the school.

Effective program components for students. All three categories reflect the perception that program components which focus on a strong yet caring educational environment are essential for establishing connections with students. The first category, consistent in-school programs, show

that most participants believed that programs were effective if they provided clear guidelines of what to expect. For example, schools that have intensive academic programs in which teachers perform similar educational routines daily, help students understand what will be expected of them academically. Consistency for many of the participants also meant "looping", or the practice of keeping the same teachers with a group of students for at least 2-3 years. The second category, establishing caring relationships, was reflecting the importance of caring attitudes toward students in order for programs to have an impact. This relationship was inclusive of administrators, teachers, counselors and others who interacted on a regular basis with students. The last category under this domain, was the perception that believing that all students can succeed, is an essential factor for effective programs. The following quote reflects the sentiment of many of the participants who share this philosophy: "Sometimes we feel like we're against the wall, it doesn't matter what we do, we just don't get anywhere with a student. But we have the philosophy-never give up on them, and we don't. We persevere, we keep insisting that the family works with us, and we learn from our success cases."

Contextual Factors That Help Sustain Interventions

This last focal area evolved from observations made by the researchers. The two domains, internal and external support structures , represent categories that clearly distinguish participants who believe interventions can help stabilize school and families and those who do not.

Internal support structures. This domain specifies the major characteristics observed within a

school setting that appeared to encourage stabilizing interventions for students and their families. Typically, participants were from schools in which there was a very high level of mutual support among the administration, teachers and staff. For example, it was common to observe teachers planning how to build upon each others work with a particular student. In many instances, school-wide academic programs were not adopted unless there was a high level of teacher/staff support (e.g. 80% or more) in favor of the program. Another key component that created a strong momentum for school interventions was the high level of commitment and enthusiasm among administrators, counselors and teachers. This was often demonstrated by frequent discussions of the benefits and successes of specific programs. Those who were directly involved with program implementation were constantly making improvements upon current programs as well as devising plans to involve more faculty and staff.

External support structures. Two categories emerged under this domain as factors outside of the school setting which enhanced the development of interventions. All schools had the support of a variety of community agencies (corporations, universities, Boys & Girls Clubs, YMCA). Most of the schools could provide extra-curricular services because of their affiliation with community-wide agencies. A few of the participants were observed training parents to help each other adjust to a new school environment. This often involved parents facilitating the orientation of new parents to the school's resource center as well as assisting them in their acquisition of additional resources (e.g. job placement, ESL classes). This supportive

arrangement increased the number of services and interventions that these schools offered..

Conclusion

The results of this descriptive study gives us insight into the various types of programs and services that are offered by schools with a high mobility rate. While most of the programs were not designed specifically for highly mobile students and their families they were perceived to have a stabilizing effect on the schools. This was primarily due to the fact that a large number of highly mobile families were able to benefit from the school's resources.

The typical school had a diverse network of programs that provided the following curricular and extra-curricular services: academic support, personal development of students, family support, and community building for students and parents. The comprehensive nature of these programs are consistent with the type of services that have been implemented in schools with a large number of students who are academically at-risk. This similarity in resources is logical since many highly mobile students also become at-risk of dropping out of school.

The specific program components that participants thought were helpful in keeping mobile families affiliated with their respective schools, emphasizes the need to establish positive relationships. For families, these relationships have to be focused on creating a sense of community at the school and demonstrating that parents are always welcome. These perceptions are supported by research that show the significant impact that community based schools can have on meeting the needs of families, and increasing parental involvement. The types of relationships

that were perceived to be effective for students emphasized the importance of clear academic expectations and educators who care about students as well as believe all students can learn. Similar findings are advocated by other researchers who identify these types of student-teacher relationships as key motivational and protective factors for helping youth overcome adversities.

Future Directions and Implications

Future research examining interventions that help stabilize highly mobile schools need to specifically address their longitudinal impact. It is crucial to know which programs are having the most significant impact on school stability (e.g., mobility rate, attendance). Findings from this research can be instrumental in designing interventions to help reduce the negative impact of mobility as well as help build the foundation for resilient youth.

While research is being planned and conducted on school mobility, there is a need for immediate action in order to reduce current problems. For instance, dialogs must be established among school districts to initiate better tracking systems for highly mobile families (e.g., comprehensive data bases), and to establish better procedures for helping students with their academic development (e.g., parallel curriculum, portfolio assessments). More school and community collaborations are needed in order to expand upon existing programs that show promise (e.g., community based schools, school and district-wide academic programs, affordable housing, family focused programs).

This study provides a foundation for future research to build upon.

References

Alexander, K. L., Dauber, S. L., & Entwisle, D. R. (1996). Children in motion: School transfers and elementary school performanc e. Journal of Educational Research, 90, 3-12.

Hayes, L. L. (1997). Schools reaching out to transient students. Counseling Today, Nove mber.

Hill, C.E., Thompson, B.J., &Williams, E.N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. The Counseling Psychologist, 25, 517-572.

Ingersoll, G. M., Scamman, J. P., & Eckerling, W. D. (1989). Geographic mobility and student achievement in an urban setting. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11, 143-149.

Karweit, N. (1997). Student mobility: An exploration of multi-level influences. Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged children: Final Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service.

Kerbow, D. (1996). Patterns of urban student mobility and local school reform. Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 1, 147-169.

Lash, A. A., & Kirkpatrick, S. L. (1990). A classroom perspective on student mobility. The Elementary School Journal, 91, 177-192.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1995). The condition of education 1995/Indicator 46 [On-line]. Available: http://nces01.ed.gov/NCES/pubs/ce/c9546a01.html

White, A. S. (1997). A preliminary evaluation of the impact of Montessori and Newcomer classrooms and the changes in the Head Start preschool program on Kenilworth student mobility. (Technical Report 97-1). Phoenix, AZ: Center for Indigenous Studies in the

Americas.

Table 1

Focal Areas, Domains, and Catergories for the sample

	Response Rate (n=18)
(Types of Programs That Stabilize Schools)	
-Educational/Academic Development	
Tutoring	Typical
Intensive school-wide academic programs	Typical
Before or after school clubs	Variant
Saturday school	–
Welcome classrooms	–
Faculty/ Staff development	–
-Personal Development of Students	
School-wide social skills activities	Typical
After school clubs	Variant
Assigned mentors	–
-Support to Provide Basic Family Needs	
Personal/Family counseling	Typical
Before & after school programs	Typical
Food & clothing bank	Typical
Health clinic	Variant
Breakfast & lunch programs	Variant
Educational development of parents	Variant
Shelter relocation service	–

-Support to Strengthen Family Bond	
Personal/Family counseling	Typical
Family support teams	Variant
Family camps	Variant
Parent education	Variant
-Community Building	
Family camps	Variant
Welcome centers	Variant
Health & resource centers	Variant
Cultural activities	Variant
Migrant liaison	–
Multiage programs	–

(School Personnel Perceptions of Effective Program Components)

-Effective Program Components for Families	
School is a community hub	Universal
Demonstrate parents are welcome	Universal
Educators have common goals	Typical
Efficiently meeting basic needs	Variant
-Effective Program Components for Students	
Consistent in-school programs	Typical
Educators that establish caring relationships	Typical
Belief that students can succeed	Typical

(Contextual Factors That Help Sustain Interventions)

-Internal Support Structures

Mutual Support among teachers	Typical
Committed and enthusiastic administrators and teachers	Typical

-External Support Structures

Community wide support	Universal
Parents trained to help each other	Variant

Note: A universal rating indicates that the category was relevant for every case, typical if relevant for at least ½ of the cases and a variant rating for categories that applied to less than ½ but more than two cases. A dash reflects categories that were applicable for only 1 or 2 cases.